

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being vague and indefinite; Claims 18, 20, 21, 22, 26-28 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Dauba et al. (USP 6,430,964) and Claims 19, 24-25 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dauba et al. Claims 18-22, 24-29 and 35 remain active.

Considering first then the Examiner's rejection of Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being vague and indefinite, it is to be noted that Claim 22 has now been appropriately amended to claim that the marking field configured for depositing the marking layer is produced by chemical and/or mechanical action on the surface of the glass pane. It is therefore submitted that Claim 22 fully complies with 35 U.S.C. §112.

Considering next then the rejection of Claims 18, 20, 21, 22, 26-28 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Dauba et al. and the rejection of Claims 19, 24-25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dauba et al., Applicants note that a review of Dauba et al. indicates that even if the adhesion of the layer on a smooth surface is acceptable, such layer can nevertheless be removed from the surface of the glass, completely and virtually without any trace, by using, for example, a blade or steel wool after heat soak test. This is as explained at page 2, lines 17-25 in the present application. In this regard, it is also noted that Dauba et al. recognizes the removability of the substance forming the marking, as claimed, for example, in Claim 6 of Dauba et al. and as explained, for example, at column 3, line 62 through column 4, line 1 which indicates that, according to one variant, the invention

advantageously provides for the substance comprising the marking to be removed at a higher temperature. As can thus be appreciated from the foregoing discussion, Dauba et al. does not meet Applicants' claimed limitation of providing a marking layer deposited on a glass pane which is permanently bonded to the marking field. Each of the claims dependent from Claim 18 contain additional limitations which, it is submitted, have no corresponding teaching or disclosure in Dauba et al. or in any of the remaining references of record.

In view of the foregoing and in view of the fact that this amendment does not raise new issues and/or considerations other than addressing the rejection of Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, entry of this amendment after final rejection is believed to be in order and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory I. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
JDH/rac

James D. Hamilton
Registration No. 28,421